



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/911,092

07/23/2001

David B. Crosbie

3180.1001-001

4017

51414

7590

05/23/2006

GOODWIN PROCTER LLP
PATENT ADMINISTRATOR
EXCHANGE PLACE
BOSTON, MA 02109-2881

EXAMINER

WANG, LIANG CHE A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2155

DATE MAILED: 05/23/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/911,092	Applicant(s) CROSBIE, DAVID B.	
	Examiner Liang-che Alex Wang	Art Unit 2155	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 April 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-18 are presented for examination.
2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 4/19/2006 has been entered.

The New Grounds of Rejection

3. Applicant's amendment and argument with respect to claims 1-18 filed on 4/19/2006 have been fully considered but they are deemed to be moot in views of the new grounds of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ramasubramani et al., hereinafter Ramasubramani, in views of Win et al., US Patent Number 6,161,139, hereinafter Win.

Art Unit: 2155

6. Referring to claim 1, Ramasubramani teaches a method for authorizing access by a user to a resource (see title and figure 2) over a wireless local area network (Col 4 lines 52-64), comprising the steps of:
 - a. setting access privileges to the resource (setting a user account corresponds to setting access privilege to resource) for a cluster of users (subscribers are a cluster of users) of the wireless local area network (Col 8 lines 29-33, setting subscriber account is inherent since user accounts are required to access information);
 - b. receiving a request from a device controlled by the user to access the resource over the wireless local area network (Col 9 lines 8-14), the user having a membership in the cluster (subscriber), and the request including a user identifier for the user (item 318 in figure 3) and a device identifier for the device (item 316) making the request (Col 9 lines 8-47);
 - c. locating access privileges in response to the user identifier and the device identifier in the received request (Col 9 lines 8-17, request is the user identifier (subscriber ID 30286123456-10900_pn.mobile.xyz .net) which contain the device ID 30286123456-10900) based on the device identifier (item 316), the user identifier (item 318), and the cluster (subscriber is member of a cluster)(Col 9 lines 10-18); and
 - d. authorizing a session between the device and the resource based on the located access privileges (Col 9 lines 42-47).

Ramasubramani does not teach wherein the cluster is indicative of the user's role in an organization and the access privileges represent data access rights of members of the cluster to the resource.

Win teaches roles that indicative of the user's role in an organization and each role has its own access right and privileges (Col 4 line 67 – Col 5 line 11).

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate organization roles with corresponding privileges of Win in Ramasubramani such that to have wherein the cluster is indicative of the user's role in an organization and the access privileges represent data access rights of members of the cluster to the resource because both Ramasubramani and Win teaches remote information accessing by subscribers.

A person with ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make the modification to Ramasubramani because having different roles with different access right and privileges would allow selectively delegate to multiple users the access control to resources connected to various network as taught by Win (Col 2 lines 35-39).

7. Referring to claims 2 and 3, claims 2 and 3 encompass the same scope of the invention as that of the claim 1. Therefore, claims 2 and 3 are rejected for the same reason as the claim 1.
8. Referring to claim 4, Ramasubramani teaches a method for managing context information for a wireless local area network, comprising the steps of:

Art Unit: 2155

- a. receiving a request to access the resource over the wireless local area network, the request including a device identifier for a device making the request (Col 9 lines 8-47);
- b. locating, in response to the received request, context information (certificate) associated with the device identifier, the context information having been assigned to the device during a previous session between the device and the resource and including access privileges associated with a cluster of users (Col 4 lines 29-36); and
- c. providing the context information to the device for use in a current session between the device and the resource (figure 4B; Col 4 lines 29-36).

Ramasubramani does not teach wherein the cluster is indicative of the user's role in an organization and the access privileges represent data access rights of members of the cluster to the resource.

Win teaches roles that indicative of the user's role in an organization and each role has its own access right and privileges (Col 4 line 67 – Col 5 line 11).

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate organization roles with corresponding privileges of Win in Ramasubramani such that to have wherein the cluster is indicative of the user's role in an organization and the access privileges represent data access rights of members of the cluster to the resource because both Ramasubramani and Win teaches remote information accessing by subscribers.

A person with ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make the modification to Ramasubramani because having different roles with different access right and privileges would allow selectively delegate to multiple users the access control to resources connected to various network as taught by Win (Col 2 lines 35-39).

9. Referring to claim 5, Ramasubramani teaches the method of claim 4, wherein the wireless local area network is based on a radio frequency suitable for use in local wireless communications (Col 4 lines 59-64).
10. Referring to claim 6, Ramasubramani teaches the method of claim 4, wherein communications over the wireless local area network are based on a spread-spectrum technique based on a carrier frequency greater than about 2,000 megahertz (Col 4 lines 59-64).
11. Referring to claim 7, Ramasubramani teaches the method of claim 4, wherein the device identifier is a unique identification number (Col 6 line 67- Col 7 line 1).
12. Referring to claim 8, Ramasubramani teaches the method of claim 4, wherein the context information includes an internet protocol address (see item 368 in figure 4B) assigned to the device in the previous secure session (Col 4 lines 29-36);.
13. Referring to claim 9, Ramasubramani teaches the method of claim 4, wherein the access privileges associated with a cluster of user was for the cluster in a previous request to access the resource (see figure 4B).
14. Referring to claim 10, Ramasubramani teaches the method of claim 4, wherein the device is a voice-enabled communications device (item 106, figure 2), and the gateway server

Art Unit: 2155

(item 114) is adapted for voice-enabled network communications (Col 4 line 66- Col 5 line 3).

15. Referring to claims 11-18 claims 11-18 encompass the same scope of the invention as that of the claims 4-10. Therefore, claims 11-18 are rejected for the same reason as the claims 4-10.

Conclusion

16. for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.
17. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Liang-che Alex Wang whose telephone number is (571)272-3992. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday, 8:30 am to 5:00 pm.
18. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached on (571)272-4006. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.
19. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 09/911,092

Page 8

Art Unit: 2155

Liang-che Alex Wang *lw*
May 15, 2006


SALEH NAJJAR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER